

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10-15, 17 and 19-21 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 10 and 19 have been amended and claims 7, 9, 16 and 18 have been canceled. Claims 1, 10 and 19 are independent. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

I. Interview

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiners Winder and Liu at the interview held April 21, 2009, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below, which constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

II. Amendment

Support for the amendments to claims 1, 10 and 19 can be found in the specification at, for example, paragraphs [0047], [0049], [0060] and [0061] and original claims 7, 9, 16 and 18. No new matter is added.

III. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10-17, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,584,466 to Serbinis et al. (Serbinis) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,029,175 to Chow et al. (Chow) and U.S. Patent No. 7,099,872 to Carpenter et al. (Carpenter); rejects claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Serbinis in view of Chow and Carpenter and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0069867 to Coutts et al. (Coutts); rejects claims 9 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Serbinis in view of Chow and Carpenter and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,330,689 to Jin et al. (Jin); and rejects claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Serbinis in view of Chow and Carpenter and further in

view of U.S. Patent No. 6,446,208 to Gujar et al. (Gujar). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1, 10 and 19 recite, *inter alia*, "deleting a subject in the subject directory based on access activity of a subject," "adding a subject to the subject directory based on access activity of a cluster of sources within a subject" and "the appropriate action is predefined in a profile directory of the user accounts." The applied references fail to teach or suggest the recited features of independent claims 1, 10 and 19.

As discussed and acknowledged during the April 21, 2009 personal interview, the Serbinis fails to teach or suggest deleting a subject in the subject directory based on access activity of a subject, adding a subject to the subject directory based on access activity of a cluster of sources within a subject, and the appropriate action is predefined in a profile directory of the user accounts. Chow, Carpenter, Coutts, Jim and Gujar fail to cure the deficiencies of Serbinis. Accordingly, the applied references, alone or in any combination, fail to teach or suggest the recited features of independent claims 1, 10 and 19.

The dependent claims are patentable at least due to their dependence on allowable independent claims 1, 10 and 19 and for the additional features they recite.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections of the claims is respectfully requested.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Obert H. Chu
Registration No. 52,744

JAO:OHC/axl

Date: April 24, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037
--